

REMARKS

In the Office action mailed on February 22, 2005, claims 1–7, 9–12, and 14–15 are rejected. Applicants traverse the rejections, amend claims 1 and 9, and request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to indicate that the passage of the network address of the first router to the first remote node includes a transmission by the first router of a message which contains such information. Support for such amendment can be found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 5–21 and in Figure 7. No new matter is added.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 8 and 16 would be allowable if they were rewritten in independent form.

Independent Claims 1 and 9 Patentably Distinguish Over Agraham

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method for communication between a first node and a first remote node via a first router. The method includes transmitting, by the first router, a message that includes the network layer addresses of the first router and the first node. Agraham fails to teach such a transmission.

Agraham describes a method of communication between a mobile node and a second node. Agraham describes a home agent for the mobile node recruiting a second router, which is closer to the second node than the home agent. Agraham refers to the closer node as a "pseudo home agent." The recruitment of a pseudo home agent avoids routing all communications from the second node to the mobile node through the mobile node's home agent.

The Action asserts that Agraham describes the transmission of the network layer addresses of the first node and the first router to the first remote node at column 5, line 63–column 6, line 6. This passage describes the home agent for the mobile node sending the

network layer addresses of the mobile node and a foreign agent serving the mobile node to the pseudo home node. In contrast, the claim recites the first router sending this information. Thus Agraham fails to describe subject matter of amended claim 1.

In addition, claim 1 specifically recites that the steps recited in the claim do not require any communication with any node on a sub-network that is a topologically home sub-network with respect to the network layer address of the first node, such as the mobile node's home agent. Agraham, however, requires communication with the mobile node's home agent.

In particular, Agraham describes two modes for a correspondent node to transmit data to a mobile node. In the first mode, the correspondent node directs data transmissions to the home agent, which then forwards the data transmissions to the mobile node. See column 5, lines 31–39. In the second mode, the home agent identifies a router to serve as a pseudo home agent, and requests that router's services. See, e.g., column 5, lines 59–62 and Figure 3; see also Action at page 3, lines 18–21. Subsequent communications from the correspondent node to the mobile node are directed through the pseudo home agent instead of the actual home agent. The first mode requires communication with the home agent for all communications between the correspondent node and the mobile node, and the second mode requires communication with the home agent to arrange for subsequent communications between the correspondent node and the mobile node. Thus neither mode of operation meets the limitations of amended independent claim 1.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection to amended independent claim 1. Claims 2–4, 6 and 7 depend from independent claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections of these claims, too. In addition, as the § 103 rejection of claim 5 does not include an additional reference to cure the deficiencies in Agraham with respect to claim 1, Applicants

request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 5. Lastly, as amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference, Applicants also request withdrawal of the objection to claim 8.

Amended independent claim 9 includes similar subject matter to amended claim 1. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of independent claim 9. Claims 10–15 depend from claim 9 and add further limitations thereto, thereto. Thus, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 and § 103 rejections to these claims. Finally, for similar reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection to claim 16.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. BBNT-P01-107 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

May 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edward A. Gordon

Registration No.: 54,130

ROPES & GRAY LLP

One International Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624

(617) 951-7000

(617) 951-7050 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant